

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.        | F                  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO.        |  |
|------------------------|--------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| 09/811,848             | 811,848 03/19/2001 |             | Doron Elgressy       | 063170.6653(20000059)   | 1687                    |  |
| 5073                   | 7590               | 05/17/2006  |                      | EXAMINER                |                         |  |
| BAKER B                | OTTS L.            | L.P.        | FIELDS, COURTNEY D   |                         |                         |  |
| 2001 ROSS<br>SUITE 600 | AVENUE             | 3           | ART UNIT             | PAPER NUMBER            |                         |  |
| DALLAS,                | TX 7520            | 1-2980      | 2137                 |                         |                         |  |
|                        |                    |             |                      | DATE MAILED: 05/17/2000 | DATE MAILED: 05/17/2006 |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No.    | Applicant(s)    |  |  |
|--------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| 09/811,848         | ELGRESSY ET AL. |  |  |
| Examiner           | Art Unit        |  |  |
| Courtney D. Fields | 2137            |  |  |

|  | Courtiley D. Fleids   | 2137  |   |
|--|---|---|---|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe  | ars on the cover sheet with the c   | orrespondence add                                   | ress                                      |
| THE REPLY FILED 24 April 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP  | LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL  | LOWANCE.  |   |
| <ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:</li> </ol>   | ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff<br>tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o<br>se with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mo  | fidavit, or other evider<br>compliance with 37 C    | rce, which<br>FR 41.31; or (3)            |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing   |   |   |   |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (a)  | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing  b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE  | g date of the final rejecti                         | on.                                       |
| TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL | on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing da | of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi | ate extension fee<br>ce action; or (2) as |
| <ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp<br/>filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte<br/>a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed</li> </ol>  | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to   | avoid dismissal of th                               | s of the date of<br>e appeal. Since       |
| AMENDMENTS   |   |   |   |
| <ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further co</li> <li>They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo</li> </ol>   | nsideration and/or search (see NO w);   | TE below);  |   |
| <ul><li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet<br/>appeal; and/or</li></ul>   | ter form for appeal by materially re  | ducing or simplifying                               | the issues for                            |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  | corresponding number of finally rej   | ected claims.                                       |   |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.   | 21. See attached Notice of Non-Co   | mpliant Amendment                                   | (PTOL-324).                               |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)   | •   |   | ,   |
| <ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>  | lowable if submitted in a separate,   | timely filed amendme                                | nt canceling the                          |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  | will not be entered, or b)    winded below or appended.  √  | II be entered and an e                              | explanation of                            |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  |   |   |   |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good answas not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>   |   |   |   |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing<br>entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of<br>showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary   | vercome all rejections under appe   | al and/or appellant fa                              | Is to provide a                           |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  | n of the status of the claims after e   | ntry is below or attact                             | ned.                                      |
| <ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but<br/>See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>  | t does NOT place the application i  | n condition for allowa                              | nce because:                              |
| 12. $\square$ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).   | (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N   | Vo(s)   |   |
| 13.  Other:  |   | g M.  |   |
| ·  | FMÍ   | ANTIEL L BANGE                                      |   |
|  | SUPERVISO   | RY PATENT EXAMINER                                  | i   |
|  |   |   |   |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Examiner believes that the prior art (Touboul et al. US Patent No. 6,167,520) discloses a network system and method for protecting a client during runtime from hostile downloadables (i.e. Java or Active X objects) comprising a server. The server is coupled a communication channel which allows the client to communicate over the Internet. (See Column 2, lines 53-67) When an application receives an Internet executable (i.e. Java or Active X object), it is stored within a temporary directory (i.e. data storage device) and only when the executable has been downloaded from the Internet, one of the threads (i.e. applet) downloads an Internet executable (i.e. Java or Active X object). (See Column 3, lines 31-54) Within the security system, the operating system probes recognizes applet instructions, therefore, a message is indicated to inform the event router. Upon receipt of a message, the event router forwards the message for notifying the user of the request, to an event log and memory management system probe which records and monitors suspicious operations. Suspicious operations are denied if the runtime monitor detect violation of an applet using more than two megabytes of RAM or when the Java virtual machine attempt to run more than five applets concurrently. (See Column 4, lines 1-23, Column 31-62). When the thread (i.e. applet) attempts to access a secured resource (i.e. client's computer, network computer, etc.), the thread is denied access if the Internet behavior of the downloadable exhibits suspicious behavior and violates (i.e. does not meet) the security policy rules. The downloadable is terminated (denied access) (See Column 5, lines 63-67, Column 6, lines 1-13).